

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
GALVESTON DIVISION**

PERFORACIONES EXPLORACION Y	§	
PRODUCCION, et al.,	§	
	§	
Plaintiffs,	§	
	§	
v.	§	CIVIL ACTION NO. G-05-419
	§	
SEACOR HOLDINGS, INC., GRUPO	§	
TMM, S.A., and MARITIMAS	§	
MEXICANA S.A. de C.V.,	§	
	§	
Defendants.	§	

ORDER


This case arises out of an allision involving a vessel owned by Defendant Maritimas Mexicana S.A. de C.V. On April 11, 2006, Defendant Seacor Holdings, Inc. filed a Rule 12(b)(6) Motion to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim, or Alternative Motion for Summary Judgment. On May 1, 2006, Plaintiffs Perforaciones Exploracion y Produccion, et al. (“Protexa”) timely filed its Response. Additionally, Protexa filed an Opposed Motion to Extend Time to Supplement Its Response to Seacor’s Motion, citing the need for additional discovery before a complete response could be made. The Court finds that Protexa’s Motion is meritorious, and hereby **GRANTS** Protexa’s Motion for Extended Time to Supplement its Response. Protexa has until June 16, 2006 to supplement its Response. Seacor’s Reply to that Response, if it chooses to file one, is due by June 26, 2006.

On the same day that Protexa filed its Response, Seacor filed another Motion to Dismiss on the grounds of international comity and Plaintiffs’ lack of standing. As to this second Motion to Dismiss, the Court instructs that Parties should not file such sequential dispositive motions, e.g.,

multiple motions to dismiss on alternative grounds, barring extenuating circumstances. With over 700 cases a year, this Court has limited resources for dealing with this type of piecemeal approach to dispositive relief. This is not meant to impugn the excellent work of Counsel on both sides of this matter, but it an effort to ensure that disputes such as these are resolved in the most expeditious and fair manner as possible. As such, if Seacor has any additional grounds for filing a motion to dismiss, it is hereby **ORDERED** to do so within five days from the date of this Order. Any and all responses to such Motions are due on June 16, 2006, with replies due by June 26, 2006. At that time, all issues raised by Seacor's Motions to Dismiss with be taken up by the Court.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DONE this 2nd day of May, 2006, at Galveston, Texas.



Samuel B. Kent
United States District Judge